

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 46. This sheet, which includes Fig. 46, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 46.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Initially, applicants note that returned with the outstanding Office Action was a Form PTO-1449 based on an Information Disclosure Statement filed October 25, 2004. The returned Form PTO-1449 did not acknowledge consideration of references AO, AQ, AR, and AT. Applicants believe that position is improper and each of those references cited in that Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) should have been acknowledged as considered. Specifically, the previously filed IDS was based on a Foreign Search Report and submitted the International Search Report as a Statement of Relevancy for the cited references. As the Statement of Relevancy was properly filed for each of the cited references, each of the references filed in that IDS should have properly been acknowledged as considered.

Thereby, applicants respectfully request that a new Form PTO-1449 be returned to applicants properly acknowledging consideration of each of the references cited in the IDS filed October 25, 2004.

The specification is amended by the present response to correct minor informalities at pages 4 and 44.

A replacement Figure 46 submitted herewith is labeled as "Prior Art", to address the objection noted in paragraph 1 of the Office Action.

A new Abstract believed to be in more proper format under United States practice is submitted, to address the objection noted in paragraph 2 of the Office Action.

Claims 4 and 5 are rewritten by the present response and are believed to have clear antecedent basis in the specification, to address the objection noted in paragraph 3 of the Office Action.

Claim 11 is canceled by the present response without prejudice, and thereby the objection noted in paragraph 4 of the Office Action is now moot.

Claims 1, 4-6, and 13-28 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 3, and 7-12 are canceled by the present response without prejudice and new claims 13-28 are added for examination. No new matter is believed to be added, as discussed in further detail below. Claims 1, 4, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-8, 10, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0057580 to Yamano et al. (herein “Yamano”). Claims 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yamano.

As noted above the present response adds new claims 13-28 for examination.

Applicants submit those claims raise no new issues of new matter. Specifically, those claims have support in the original specification as follows.

With respect to new dependent claim 13, see the original specification at page 297, line 16 to page 298, line 2.

With respect to new dependent claim 14, see the original specification at page 321, line 21 to page 323, line 19.

With respect to new dependent claim 15, see the original specification at Figures 13, 16, and 19 and at page 95, lines 21-25.

With respect to new dependent claim 16, see the original specification at page 368, line 24 to page 369, line 19, as an example.

With respect to new dependent claim 17, see selection circuit in Figure 125 and the corresponding recitation, and the original specification at page 172, line 4 to page 173, line 3.

With respect to new dependent claim 18, see the current output circuit in Figures 48-64 and the voltage output circuit in Figures 65 and 66, and the corresponding descriptions thereof.

With respect to new independent claim 19, see the original specification at page 297, lines 17-25, and particularly the reference to the “power consumption consumed in the

display screen or a data corresponding to the power consumption”, and see the specification at page 306, line 16 to page 307, line 5, and the specification at page 314, lines 11-25.

With respect to new dependent claim 20, see the original specification at Figure 83 and at page 328, lines 4-12, particularly the reference to “gamma-conversion”.

With respect to new independent claim 21, see the original specification at page 297, line 16 to page 298, line 2, and particularly the recitation to “the power consumption or the data as obtained from the inputted video signal to the EL display apparatus”.

With respect to new independent claim 22, see the original specification at Figures 13, 16, and 19 and at page 95, lines 21-25.

With respect to new dependent claim 23, see the original specification at page 368, line 24 to page 369, line 19.

With respect to new dependent claim 24, see the original specification at page 321, line 21 to page 322, line 19.

With respect to new dependent claim 25, see Figure 125 and the corresponding description, and the original specification at page 172, line 4 to page 173, line 3.

With respect to new dependent claim 26, see the “current output circuit” in Figures 48-64 and the “voltage output circuit” in Figures 65 and 66, and the corresponding description.

With respect to new dependent claim 27, see the original specification at page 172, lines 11-20.

With respect to new dependent claim 28, see the original specification at Figure 3 and at page 80, line 15 to page 81, line 2.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1, 4, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Claim 1 is amended by the present response to no longer refer to "image data". Claim 1 is also amended by the present response to clarify the operation of turning off the switching element. The amendments to claim 1 are believed to clarify the language noted as indefinite in the Office Action.

Claims 4 and 6 are also amended by the present response to clarify the language noted as unclear therein.

In view of the presently submitted amendments, each of claims 1, 4, and 6 are believed to be in full compliance with all requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Addressing the above-noted prior art rejections based on Yamano, those rejections are traversed by the present response. Specifically, Yamano is not a valid reference against the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by virtue of its publication date.

More specifically, the present application has a U.S. filing date of October 25, 2004, and is based on PCT/JP03/02598 filed on March 6, 2003.

Yamano is based on PCT Application PCT/JP02/09668, which was published in Japanese as WO 03/027998. As that corresponding PCT application to Yamano was published in Japanese, Yamano is not entitled to a 102(e) date of its PCT filing date of September 20, 2002. Yamano is in that respect only entitled to its U.S. Patent Application Publication date of March 17, 2005. The filing date of the present application anti-dates that publication date of March 17, 2005 for Yamano, and thus Yamano is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) or § 103(a). Yamano in that respect is also not prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

Thereby, the outstanding rejection has misconstrued the effective filing date of Yamano relative to the claims, and Yamano is not validly applied against the pending claims. Thereby, the outstanding rejections based on Yamano are traversed by the present response.

In view of the present response applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Eckhard H. Kuesters
Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Surinder Sachar
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

I:\ATTY\SNS\25s\259686\259686US-AM.DOC